

From: "giftmarketing@idaho.net%inter2" <giftmarketing@idaho.net>
Subject: Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 12/23/2005 03:00 PM CST
Date Sent: 12/23/2005 03:00:43 CST
Date Received: 12/23/2005 03:01:12 CST

Email: giftmarketing@idaho.net

FirstName: Malcolm

LastName: Dell

Address1: PO Box 709

Address2:

City: Orofino

State: Idaho

zipcode: 83544

Question1: I have no answer for this problem. The issue is too big to handle with pat answers. People who love farming (and I mean getting your hands dirty, not driving a \$300,000 machine), can no longer afford the lifestyle.

Question2: I am not sure of the impacts in all industries, but US producers are losing huge market share to domestic markets due to LACK of COOL labeling. For example, most consumers have no idea of the percentage of foreign beef going into their diets, and "big meat" companies continue to successfully derail efforts to let consumers know if they are eating US beef or foreign beef. Most of us would pay more for domestic beef (I believe), especially if we knew how little we were currently getting. Congress is hypocritical on this issue. Supposedly the cost of COOL is "too expensive" to bigger companies who want to continue using inexpensive foreign beef. But this is a lost marketing opportunity for new and smaller and sustainable ag producers who operate domestically (with much frustration and lost income.)

Question3: If you look at results THERE CAN BE NO DOUBT FARM POLICY IS REWARDING CORPORATE, LARGE SCALE FARMING! We need more diversification, specialty crops incentives, and reduction of barriers (e.g. inspection costs) to producers in niche markets such as organic, and non-traditional livestock species (e.g. elk, buffalo), etc. (This does not mean we should gut past organic standards, to suit big business, which is what Congress recently did.)

Question4: Current policies support either huge fields running large machinery or no production at all (CRP). Wildlife and soil both benefit from combinations of cover and agricultural crops IN SMALL FIELDS with PLENTY OF BRUSHY FENCE ROWS. Where are incentives to reduce field size and machinery, thereby creating broadscale land conservation? (Note that conservation implies USE). Policy has created patchwork unproductivity (CRP) surrounded by massive areas of land erosion and soil rape? Lets go back to our roots, to when things were in balance. The sustainable agriculture movement is doing that, slowly, but farm policy should work harder to reverse the trends they have created, and be more "sustainable friendly." Hunting and fishing was good when we had small fields with lots of fence rows. If we can pay farmers not to farm, surely we can find incentives to reduce average field sizes??

Question5: In mountainous rural America, we still do not have high speed internet or consistent cell phone coverage. With respect to the internet, too hilly for wireless (requiring line of sight) and too far out of town (three mile limit) for DSL. TV cable usually stops at the city limits. The best opportunity to invest in rural America (at least in the Rocky Mountains or Pacific Northwest) is a program to accelerate incentives to rural electric utilities to provide broadband to their scattered constituents, and help them make the investment cost effective. For cell phones, we need MORE TOWERS in small towns. This would be a VERY SIMPLE GRANT PROGRAM. The other rural incentives we need would support "clusters" of SMALL, related businesses (and I do not mean

the ludicrous federal definition of a small business... I am talking about mom-and-pops, to businesses with 5 or ten employees -- that is what is sustainable in a small community.) The 200-employee business recruitment model, which results in the yo-yo economics of the past (large corps bring in the mills, then off they go when the market changes). If economic history has taught us anything, it is that value-added resource based businesses contribute long term to a community ONLY when the ownership resides locally, where they have a vested interest in the local community. Distant investors or owners of large companies DO NOT CARE WHAT HAPPENS TO SMALL TOWNS and its RURAL RESIDENTS. Rural policy should also DRAMATICALLY INCREASE incentives for value-added resource based SMALL businesses, ranging from wood and fiber art, to gourmet foods and log furniture, to niche tourism.

Question6: Niche markets in the age of the Internet ARE THE FUTURE. YES, YES, YES. More incentives. Get us further away from an exclusive commodity agriculture base, and into value-added specialty niches, including arts, gourmet foods, woodworking, pottery, soaps, candles, specialty tours, etc where a business that CAN be successful in a small town (with the aid of the Internet) has a chance to succeed long term. Sustainability is NOT supported by the yo-yo economics of bringing large employers to town. SMALL IS BEAUTIFUL. A target value-added or specialty business for federal rural policy should have 2-10 employees, including the owners. Promoting CLUSTERS of these types of businesses, to create a synergistic reputation in a specific niche (e.g. wood art, or fiction authors, or gourmet foods) is the key, if you study small town success stories (which are hard to find). A complete change in federal mindset is required, along with a renovation of the "testosterone economics" based on recruiting large businesses in a zero sum game, just so local politician can pat themselves on the back. The yo-yo economics of larger employers coming to a small town DO NOT SUPPORT SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES. THEY ONLY PAD THE EGOS OF POLITICIANS WHO DO NOT TRULY UNDERSTAND SMALL TOWN ECONOMICS and SUSTAINABLE LIFESTYLES.